



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

SCIENCE

NEW YORK, MARCH 9, 1894.

CURRENT NOTES ON ANTHROPOLOGY. NO. XLI.

(Edited by D. G. Brinton, M.D., LL. D., D. Sc.)

THE HIEROGLYPHS OF EASTER ISLAND.

IN a previous note (see *Science*, May 8, 1892) I have referred to the curious carved hieroglyphs which the Easter Islanders were accustomed to preserve on batons or narrow tablets. The art is lost, and few of the batons remain, as the present generation burnt up most of them for firewood! A genuine one would now be worth its weight in gold—or, at least, in silver. The last and best work on the translation of the inscriptions has lately been published from the posthumous papers of Bishop Tepano Jaussen, apostolic vicar of Tahiti, who included in his diocese Easter Island also. He secured a few of the tablets, and some intelligent natives read them for him, explaining the meaning of each hieroglyph. These he collated, and they are printed in dictionary form, analyzed as far as possible. They prove to be ideographic in character, and are read *boustrophedon*.

The Bishop took much pains to discover the origin of this writing, sending specimens of it widely over Oceanica for comparison. He finally decided that it was brought "more than a thousand years ago" from the Moluccas and the Spice Islands, almost an identical writing having been discovered on ancient stone monuments in the island of Celebes by Archbishop Claessens, of Batavia.

This excellent study of Jaussen's is a pamphlet of 32 pages, entitled "L'Ile de Paques," and may be had of Ernest Leroux, 28 Rue Bonaparte, Paris. It is indispensable for every student of the subject.

PALÆOLITHIC VERSUS NEOLITHIC.

IN the Journal of the Anthropological Institute for February an important article appears from the pen of Prof. Boyd Dawkins, entitled "On the Relation of the Palæolithic to the Neolithic Period." His main point is to prove that nowhere in the Old or New World can we trace the transition in culture between these two periods. Everywhere there seems a gap or hiatus, sharply dividing the two, this break extending also to the fauna of the two epochs.

This opinion was long ago maintained by Mortillet and other eminent archæologists, but has lately been denied by J. Allen Brown and others. Professor Dawkins makes a strong plea for its correctness; but, after all, his argument has the weakness inherent in reasoning *ab ignorantia*. The most he can show is that *not yet* have the steps of the continuity of the periods been demonstrated; while it would surely be difficult for one familiar with the diligent studies of investigators not to be convinced that there is no such sharp line between the two cultures as was once

laid down. For instance, all must now concede that palæolithic man made pottery, which was long denied him.

An interesting part of Professor Dawkins's article is that on the so-called palæolithic implements from the Trenton gravels, New Jersey. He has visited that locality himself and collected some of the specimens of which he speaks. His conclusion is, that there is no sufficient evidence for considering any of the Trenton finds as palæolithic; and that the theories which have been built upon them by their finders will have to be discarded. Evidence of another kind than the mere rude form of implements is needed to determine the presence of palæolithic man in America.

THE SO-CALLED "CRIMINAL TYPE."

THE all-important question among criminologists is, whether there is a peculiar physical type, which at once marks and condemns the habitual criminal. Reference has already been made in these notes to the wide difference of opinion on this subject which obtained at the last International Congress of Criminal Anthropology (see *Science*, Nov. 18, 1892). In a paper read before the Russian Anthropological Society last October, Prof. E. Petri, of St. Petersburg, declared in favor of the reality of the "type," maintaining that it had been denied because of lack of uniformity in modes of measurement, and in the technical nomenclature, as well as from a neglect of proper selection of cases. He argued that a so-called "pure series" of criminal types could be obtained, and would always show clearly defined contrasts to a series of non-criminal individuals.

On the other hand, the legal profession almost unanimously deny the existence of the "type." Take, they say, a dozen criminals as they come into the dock, wash and dress them as neatly, and they will certainly look as well as the dozen men in the jury box impanelled to pronounce upon their misdeeds. To be sure, many criminals are such through want, misery and destitution, and these leave their traces; but as many more have not suffered in this manner; and a large class of crimes demand a well-regulated life for their commission; so the average is maintained. Of course, exception must be made in either case, of mental alienation, idiocy, insanity and the like.

THE PLEIADES IN EARLY ASTRONOMY.

THE prominent position which the group of the Pleiades occupies in many early myths and calendars has recently attracted the attention of several writers. Prof. Norman Lockyer, in his "Dawn of Astronomy," shows that the oldest temple on the Acropolis of Athens was oriented to observe the rising of the Pleiades about the year 1530 B.C.; thus connecting the worship of these stars with the primitive religion of the Hellenes.

The subject has been considered at length and with much thoroughness by Dr. Richard Andree, in a late number of *Globus* (Bd. 64, No. 22). He analyzes the names of the constellation in many languages, and explains its relation in primitive peoples to their calendars and agricultural procedures. He shows that among the most diverse races and in all parts of the globe, these stars have been chosen either to indicate the beginning of years or cycles, or to regulate festivals and recurrent ceremonies.

One who has also given fruitful attention to this question is Mr. R. G. Haliburton, whose results, many of them not yet published, are spoken of by Dr. J. C. Hamilton in the last (fifth) Report of the Canadian Institute of Toronto. He brings together a mass of curious information concerning primitive beliefs about these stars.

The question has special interest in American archæology. At the Anthropological Congress in Chicago last summer, Mrs. Zelia Nuttall read a paper in which she referred to the well-known fact that by these stars the Aztecs regulated their cycle of 52 years. If they had commenced their computation when at that season the Pleiades culminated at midnight, it would be about 4000 years ago,—a deduction which gives rise to interesting speculations.

WHAT IS ARCHÆAN?

BY ALFRED C. LANE, HOUGHTON, L. S., MICHIGAN.

WHEN in the issue of the *Nation* for March 1, 1894, p. 163, I saw my friend Professor Tarr criticised for calling the Huronian Archæan, and saw the reviewer go on to state that the rocks in which magnetic iron ores mostly occur are not undoubted Archæan, I said, "This is *too much*."

The history of the words Azoic and Archæan shows the irony of fate in scientific usage so well as to be worthy the attention of the readers of *Science*.

The term Azoic was originally applied to all the pre-Silurian strata, at first including the intrusives.¹ Later Foster and Whitney excluded them and applied the term to the metamorphic group or formation,²—composed of "Gneiss, Mica and Hornblende Slate, Chlorite, Talcose and Argillaceous Slate, and Beds of Quartz and Saccharoidal Marble,"—supposed to be the first detrital rocks, modified by heat. They expressly mention the association of magnetic iron ores with them,³ and give Logan's division into two groups, which they say they failed to recognize on the south shore of Lake Superior.⁴ The Azoic rocks included all rocks below the Potsdam,⁵ existing as a geologic system in the Lake Superior region.

Dana objected to the application of the term Azoic,⁶ as a misnomer, since there are direct and indirect traces of life in the rocks to which it was applied, and proposed the term Archæan instead. In his use of the term, Archæan is a name applied to one of the four or five primary divisions of geologic time, co-ordinate with the term Palæozoic. In this he has been followed by Geikie and Leconte. From the text-books of these three men, probably ninety-nine per cent of living American geologists have been taught. Moreover, Dana retained the

¹Van Hise, Archæan and Algonkian, Bulletin No. 86, United States Geological Survey, 1892, p. 470; but compare Foster and Whitney, p. 3.

²Foster and Whitney, Lake Superior, part ii., 1851, p. 2.

³Ibid., p. 8.

⁴Ibid., p. ix; compare Van Hise, loc. cit., p. 470.

⁵Ibid., p. 2.

⁶Van Hise, loc. cit., pp. 394, 473.

⁷Manual of Geology, 1880, p. 140.

⁸Summarized in Van Hise, loc. cit., p. 469.

term Azoic,⁷ applying it to the earlier part of the Archæan time, and to the latter part applying the term Eozoic in his manual of geology, Archæozoic in a paper published in 1892.⁸

The arrangement in Dana's text-book seemed an admirable one, was widely adopted, and all seemed serene, when trouble arose. The first symptom of it appeared in a circular letter of the Director of the United States Geological Survey, wherein he suggested the division of Geologic time into ten periods, to which provisional names were given.⁹ The name Archæan was applied to a period below the Cambrian, co-ordinate with it, and separated from it by another period.

No comment nor notice was made on this degradation of the rank of the word, and of course in a provisional scheme it was not necessary. But when in pursuance of this letter the name Archæan was formally applied to a time division earlier than the time of deposition of the clastic rocks older than the Cambrian, and co-ordinate with Cambrian,¹⁰ the mischief was done.

The term Archæan, introduced to replace Azoic as a misnomer, has been so changed in application by the United States Geological Survey as to include only rocks which cannot but be Azoic.

There certainly could have been no life before the beginning of sedimentation.

The only reason for this change, that I know of, is given by Van Hise in the following words:¹¹

"As here used the term Archæan is restricted to this fundamental complex. It is no longer possible to regard as a unit or treat together all pre-Cambrian rocks. The rocks included in the fundamental complex are everywhere called Azoic or Archæan. The crystallines and semi-crystallines above this complex, often called Archæan, must be distributed from the Devonian or later to the pre-Cambrian. It is clear that if Archæan is to remain a serviceable term it must be restricted to some unit. Such a unit is the fundamental complex, and to it this term is most appropriate."

Comment is hardly needful, in view of the fact that for some four hundred and seventy eight pages Professor Van Hise has been treating all the pre-Cambrian rocks together, and that, as he avers, "it is impossible to make a wholly satisfactory theoretical definition of the Archæan" (as he uses it).

I should perhaps add that while I still think that the Archæan will "remain a serviceable term," if retained in the sense in which it was proposed, and is used by all the leading text-books, not only in America, but also in England (Geikie), and Germany (Credner and Neumayr) and is employed by the *Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geologie, etc.* (as one of four or five divisions of geologic time co-ordinate wth Palæozoic), I do not here question the appropriateness of its division, nor attempt to combat the arguments so ably urged by Van Hise¹² for the crustal or sub-crustal character of the fundamental complex. I merely cannot see why the time-division given by Dana is not satisfactory, and why the time previous to the formation of clastics should not be called Azoic. Then for a parallel formation term, according to the principles of that dual nomenclature, rightly proposed by H. S. Williams, Van Hise's term Basement Complex seems to me very appropriate. Possibly Basal, as somewhat shorter, and in adjectival form more correspondent with other terms, might be better. The age of the Basal, so far as formed by subcrustal consolidation, might not be altogether Azoic, but it would all belong to one formation.

⁹Tenth Annual Report of the Director, United States Geological Survey, 1890, p. 59.

¹⁰Ibid., p. 66.

¹¹Van Hise, loc. cit., p. 478.

¹²Van Hise, *American Journal of Geology*, vol. i., p. 113.